

Date: Fri, 7 May 93 20:12:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #132
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 7 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 132

Today's Topics:

 Autopatch
 More on no-code (4 msgs)
 no-code defense (2 msgs)
 Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m (3 msgs)
 sick of it all (2 msgs)
 What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 06 May 93 23:30:01 -0400
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!nanovx!
dragon!blackwlf!nj8j!ben@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Content limits on amateur radio: Remarks of a technical or personal
> nature too unimportant to require access to the public switched network.

Actually, that wording is only used for international communications(see
97.117). Those limitations don't apply to domestic amateur radio
communication.

Ben

Ben Coleman NJ8J	"All that is not eternal is	
Packet: NJ8J@W4Q0.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA	eternally irrelevant."	
Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us		
or ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com	C. S. Lewis	

Date: 7 May 93 14:35:37 GMT
 From: ogicse!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
 resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
 Subject: More on no-code
 To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

--

I am a computer programmer. Years before I began programming, programmers used punch cards and before that they actually used wire-wrap boards or punch-blocks to write programs. If the anti-no-coders were also computer programmers, would they expect all new programmers to learn to program using wire-wrap or punch cards? And would they complain about the scumbag PCers who started out working with a nothing operating system like DOS?

An even better analogy may be assembler language. It is the lowest level of computer languages and was almost required for early programmers. Today, most programmers don't ever learn assembler - or if they do they soon forget it due to disuse. It can be argued that a good programmer will EVENTUALLY have to learn assembler in order to really understand computers. If it was required that all programmers become proficient in assembler before being allowed to enter the "brotherhood/sisterhood" of computer programmers - the number of programmers would diminish - but that would again keep out most of the scumbag PCers.

Yes - code is of value in the HF bands and of lesser value in other bands, but some incentive must be provided to keep the brotherhood/sisterhood from disappearing. After hearing some of the arguments here I take back my statement that code should be eliminated or reduced (in speed requirements) for all classes. I will be going for my no-code technician on the 22nd and plan to proceed to extra - code or no-code. Bye...

BTW - Hams should stick together - the "enemy" is the misinformed public who do not understand what ham is all about. Several cases have come up lately which indicate that the courts do not recognize the rights of hams - even when it's in the statutes.

+++++

+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer

+

+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+

+++++

Date: Fri, 7 May 93 17:45:40 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May7.143537.12466@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov
(Tom Bodoh) writes:

>I am a computer programmer. Years before I began programming, programmers
>used punch cards and before that they actually used wire-wrap boards or
>punch-blocks to write programs. If the anti-no-coders were also computer
>programmers, would they expect all new programmers to learn to program
>using wire-wrap or punch cards? And would they complain about the scumbag
>PCers who started out working with a nothing operating system like DOS?

If this analogy had any validity, then CW usage would have first disappeared
with the development of AM voice, and most certainly would have died with the
widespread use of SSB. The simple matter of fact is that of the two manual
modulation schemes available to human beings (voice and morse code), CW is
about 25 times as spectrally efficient on a per - user basis. From a
historical perspective, it's about a decade older than voice, but that's
hardly criteria for antequation.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Fri, 7 May 1993 18:24:39 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>, paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

|> In article <1993May7.143537.12466@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov
(Tom Bodoh) writes:

|> >I am a computer programmer. Years before I began programming, programmers

```

|> >used punch cards and before that they actually used wire-wrap boards or
|> >punch-blocks to write programs. If the anti-no-coders were also computer
|> >programmers, would they expect all new programmers to learn to program
|> >using wire-wrap or punch cards? And would they complain about the scumbag
|> >PCers who started out working with a nothing operating system like DOS?
|>
|> If this analogy had any validity, then CW usage would have first disappeared
|> with the development of AM voice, and most certainly would have died with the
|> widespread use of SSB. The simple matter of fact is that of the two manual
|> modulation schemes available to human beings (voice and morse code), CW is
|> about 25 times as spectrally efficient on a per - user basis. From a
|> historical perspective, it's about a decade older than voice, but that's
|> hardly criteria for antequation.
|>
|> --
|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

```

```

--
I'm starting to understand some of the views of the pro-coders but I wonder
if the testing requirement has kept it alive or would it have stood on
it's own merits alone? I really do see where it is more efficient in some
cases, such as auto-id and preserving spectrum, etc - but I also see a need
to recruit some new hams - and the code requirement has kept out some
potential hams which have a lot to offer (such as myself ;) ). I also
admit that you are going to get some new recruits who see this as CB with
more spectrum - hence the controversy. But what really tees me off are
the ferferent anti-no-coders who would label all of the newcomers as
undesirables. I don't have the answer to the dilemma other than to hope
that the 'old timers' who had to learn code not 'throw the baby out with
the bath'.

```

```

+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198      (605) 594-6830      +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++

```

```

-----

```

```

Date: 7 May 93 16:33:02 CDT
From: unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-
state.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!linac!uchinews!raistlin!
timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.@mvpb.saic.com

```

Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 18391@leland.Stanford.EDU, paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

```
|-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."  
                        ^^^^ ^^^^ ^ ^^^^  ^^^ ^^^^ ^^^^^ ^^^^ ^ ^^^  
|->paulf@Stanford.EDU   |  -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)
```

First off I would name Col. Gregory Boyinton. ;^)

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

They moved all the streets around while you were sleeping last night.

Date: 7 May 93 17:22:21 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

```
>Just listen to two meters and 70 cm. They are a disaster around here.  
>Jamming and intenonal[sic] interference have increased sharply  
>aounrd[sic] here.
```

Well based upon the abuse you guys at sbs seem to dish out to other hams, I can't say that I blame them. I travel a fair amount and typically take a dual band rig with me. I've yet to hear these problems you speak about. In Chicago I've heard *one* jammer in the last 18 months on the FM portions of those bands and none on the CW/SSB portions of those bands. Why not take your conversations down to the CW portions of those bands. You'll get to use your favorite mode of communication and I doubt the jammers will bother you there. And if they follow you down there, then I guess it's pretty obvious why.

Perhaps if you guys climbed down from your pedestals you might find that the earth isn't such a bad place. Isn't that why the gods in ancient Greek mythology came down to earth, to see things first hand? As far as I can tell, the only thing incentive licensing has done is create a class of operators who think they're better than everyone else. Must get lonely at the top.

Actually I think these sbs postings are all just flame bait. I suspect the amateurs in their listening area have already tuned this little clique out so they are looking for another audience to stir things up. That's probably why they keep their postings in rec.radio.amateur.misc.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 07 May 1993 23:12:44 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>I travel a fair amount and
>typically take a dual band rig with me. I've yet to hear these
>problems you speak about.

Obviously you don't visit Rhode dYland all that much.

>In Chicago I've heard *one* jammer in the
>last 18 months on the FM portions of those bands and none on the
>CW/SSB portions of those bands. Why not take your conversations down
>to the CW portions of those bands.

For one reason, it is difficult to convey as much information via CW in the same amount of time that you can via voice.

>As far as I can tell, the only thing incentive licensing has done is
>create a class of operators who think they're better than everyone
>else.

But, we are. That's why we're in the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater Association, and you are not. Unless, of course, you wish to pay the \$4,000 no-code membership fee, submit the 5,000 word essay on why you want to be a member, and take the 100 question oral examination on license-class relevant information from Part 97 and the ARRL handbook.

But, as is consistent with your type, I'm sure you just memorized the

question pools, and really don't remember all that much about "theory" anyway...

>That's probably why they keep their postings in
>rec.radio.amateur.misc.

No, just that .policy is a bandwidth deadzone.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ	/	Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net	/	these opinions generally
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz	/	reflect those of my
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347	/	company...

Date: 7 May 93 17:31:52 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I read something in a recent Radio Fun column by KA1BUM (?) talking about RTTY and Amtor -- the usual explanation then he said you needed a General class license or above to use RTTY/Amtor on HF. This jangled with a couple of other things I had heard so I went to my copy of Part 97.

So I looked up 97.301 (e). OK no frequency sharing requirements on 10m.

Then I looked at 97.505(c). Two entities apply:

Band	Freqs	Modes	Standard see 97.307(f)
10m	28.0 to 28.3	RTTY, Data	(4)
10m	28.3 to 28.5	Phone, Image	(1), (2) and (10)

97.307(f)

(4) RTTY limited to less than 1200 baud and 1kHz shift

(1) No angle modulated emission with modulation index > 1

(2) No none phone emission shall be no wider than a phone emission

(10) A station holding a Novice or Technician Class operator licence may only transmit CW emission using the international morse code or phone emissions J3E or R3E.

So it strikes me as some people are taking 97.307(f)(10) to mean you

can only use CW/SSB on 10m if you are a novice/tech. But this is only half the truth as the rules really let you use 28.1 to 28.3 for RTTY, Amtor, Pactor, Packet etc in addition to CW. The comment in Radio Fun is inaccurate.

This also explains why the HTX-100 has mike connections that make it easy to attach to TNC or multi-mode controller.

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP

a-kevinp@microsoft.com

"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: 7 May 93 20:49:55 GMT
From: telesoft!garym@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <9305071732.AA17515@netmail.microsoft.com> a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

>So it strikes me as some people are taking 97.307(f)(10) to mean you
>can only use CW/SSB on 10m if you are a novice/tech. But this is only
>half the truth as the rules really let you use 28.1 to 28.3 for RTTY,
>Amtor, Pactor, Packet etc in addition to CW. The comment in Radio Fun
>is inaccurate.

You are correct, Novice and Technicians (with HF privileges) are authorized to use all the digital modes that are authorized to higher class licensees on 10m.

--GaryM

--

Gary Morris KK6YB
San Diego, CA USA

Internet: garym@alsys.com
Phone: +1 619-457-2700 x128 (work)

Date: 7 May 1993 21:08:06 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> So it strikes me as some people are taking 97.307(f)(10) to mean you
> can only use CW/SSB on 10m if you are a novice/tech. But this is only
> half the truth as the rules really let you use 28.1 to 28.3 for RTTY,
> Amtor, Pactor, Packet etc in addition to CW. The comment in Radio Fun
> is inaccurate.

Sorry, wrong.

The limitations are over and above what the table says. That's what a LIMITATION is. It makes no sense otherwise to think that because it has something more general to which the limitation is attached, you can ignore the limitation.

For technician
(and novice) class operators this means:

On their part of 80, 40, and 15, Technicians and novices can use only CW.
On their part of 10, Technicians and novices can only use

Date: 7 May 93 17:22:10 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mswmod@nimbus.sage.unr.edu (stark) writes:

>Gee, if all I want to do is buy a radio and use CW, why should
>I have to pass any kind of electronics test?

If it was a non-electronic radio, you didn't operate it, and there were no regulations for it, then you'd be right as the written exam would be irrelevant to your activity. Then again, using the logic that's been used by others, what are you whining about. You can already do that under Part 15 rules. :-)

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 6 May 93 12:44:26 GMT
From: ogicse!das-news.harvard.edu!spdcc!merk!harvee.billerica.ma.us!
esj@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <QBE562E9@mmmpc6>, Howard Lester writes:

>Since almost anyone can talk, and a lot of folks seem to think that Morse is
>an antiquated form of communication, I suggest we eliminate BOTH the CW and
>written exams as licensing requirements. Licenses should be issued by simple

>recommendation. Here's how it works:

>

>Prospective hams only need visit the shack of an already licensed amateur,
>and successfully engage in five(5) QSO's on any band. The prospective ham
>will need to report his/her name and location (QTH), and be able to
>demonstrate the use of Q-signals, such as saying "QSL" every time the
>conversation is turned over to him/her. That's all it takes. Then, the
>existing amateur sends in a form recommending you, and, within just a
>month or two, you're on the air as a licensed amateur radio operator.

>

>Is this what you want?

oooooh sarcasm...

In reality, you're not too far off. I have always advocated new hams should operate for some period of time under the watchful eye of a more experienced ham or group of hams. I also advocate that the licensing process should include operating under (semi)real conditions not unlike a drivers test.

--- eric

--

HOME: esj@harvee.billerica.ma.us HAM kaleec

WORK: 617.630.4687 (w) esj@ruby.polaroid.com

source of the public's fear of the unknown since 1956

Date: 8 May 1993 02:33:03 GMT

From: jgervais@ucsd.edu

Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, so ignoring the code/no-code thing, it seems to me that the one thing most of us (on both sides) agree on is that the written exam is a joke.

So, how about we all abandon the code debate, get together and start ranting to the FCC/ARRL/whoever to restructure the theory exams? It seems to me to be the one area that would guarantee a higher-caliber individual getting the license. Sure there'd still be the occassional jerk, but hey, it's always better to argue with a smart-ass than a dumb-ass. :-)

Any takers? At least we'd be doing something productive, and that could genuinely improve the ham community.

Possibilities:

- Limit amount of fill-in-the-blank questions
 - Problems: Increases work for VECs
 - Benefits: Requires at least a little more brain power
- Don't publish exams/answers
 - Problems: How do you know you're getting a *real* FCC exam?
 - Benefits: Obvious
- Require a verbal/written explanation of how a transceiver actually works
 - Problems: Grading could be too subjective
 - Benefits: If you can't at least understand this, you may well not qualify to be a ham in the first place. Explanation doesn't have to be too deep, just cover the basics.

(You fill in/critique from here...)

73 de KD6PRD

Joe Gervais jgervais@ucsd.edu
13 WPM or Bust!

"So... if she... weighs the same as a	Mystery Science Theatre 3000	
duck... she's made of wood."	"It's not just cool, it's the	
"And therefore?"	only thing on TV Saturday	
"...a witch!!!"	afternoons."	

Date: Fri, 7 May 93 19:23:13 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May7.143537.12466@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May7.182439.20154@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May7.182439.20154@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov
(Tom Bodoh) writes:

>I really do see where it is more efficient in some
>cases, such as auto-id and preserving spectrum, etc - but I also see a need
>to recruit some new hams - and the code requirement has kept out some
>potential hams which have a lot to offer (such as myself ;)).

I absolutely agree. That's why I supported the no-code Technician NPRM.
The CW entry level requirement made the novice and tech licenses a hard sell
to potential newcomers. Once licensed, most (a 2:1 majority) have found

enough merit in learning CW to upgrade. And there's no shortage of VHF/UHF spectrum, either.

>But what really tees me off are
>the fervent anti-no-coders who would label all of the newcomers as
>undesirables. I don't have the answer to the dilemma other than to hope
>that the 'old timers' who had to learn code not 'throw the baby out with
>the bath'.

What's really sad is that most of the "anti-no-coders" seem to be ignorant of the fact that two thirds of the "no-coders" have upgraded. By alienating a group of potential future CW fanatics, they seem to be shooting themselves in the foot. Of course, the "anti-cw" crowd is just as foolish...

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Fri, 7 May 93 17:35:08 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May6.170713.1600@nnntp2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May6.184511.5625@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May7.011541.27666@ke4zv.uucp>p
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <1993May7.011541.27666@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>I've read Part 97, I've even read the Communications Act of 1934, but
>I don't see *rationing* mentioned in either one. Instead I see things
>like "to make available, so far as possible, to all people of the United
>States" and "Continuation and extension" and "Encouragement and improvement"
>and "Expansion of existing reservoir". Not a word about rationing.

How about reading up on the laws of physics? Spectrum is a *limited* resource which by the Act of '34 is supposed to be managed by the FCC. Putting too many users in a spectral space is *not* management, it's anarchy, as has been demonstrated by the 27 MHz CB debacle. In addition, don't forget that the spectrum in question (HF) has to be managed jointly with *every* ITU member, to which the Act of '34 does not apply.

> Must be Clinton speak.

Hey, I'm not the one proposing socialism of the airwaves, Tovarisch...

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: Fri, 07 May 1993 03:59:00 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.unomaha.edu!
nevada.edu!jimi!physics.unr.edu!nimbus!mswmod@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May6.170713.1600@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May6.184511.5625@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May7.011541.27666@ke4zv.uucp>u
Subject : Re: sick of it all

Gee, if all I want to do is buy a radio and use CW, why should
I have to pass any kind of electronics test?

73s & cul
Ron, KU7Y

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #132
